



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2018

Relativisation strategies in Slovene: diachrony between language use and language description

Sonnenhauser, Barbara

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110531435-014>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-150114>

Book Section

Published Version

Originally published at:

Sonnenhauser, Barbara (2018). Relativisation strategies in Slovene: diachrony between language use and language description. In: Grkovic-Major, Jasmina; Hansen, Björn; Sonnenhauser, Barbara. Diachronic Slavonic Syntax : The Interplay between Internal Development, Language Contact and Metalinguistic Factors. Berlin: De Gruyter, 387-406.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110531435-014>

Jasmina Grković-Major, Björn Hansen, Barbara Sonnenhauser
Diachronic Slavonic Syntax

Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs

Editor

Volker Gast

Editorial Board

Walter Bisang

Jan Terje Faarlund

Hans Henrich Hock

Natalia Levshina

Heiko Narrog

Matthias Schlesewsky

Amir Zeldes

Niina Ning Zhang

Editor responsible for this volume

Volker Gast

Volume 315

Diachronic Slavonic Syntax

The Interplay between Internal Development, Language
Contact and Metalinguistic Factors

Edited by
Jasmina Grković-Major
Björn Hansen
Barbara Sonnenhauser

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN: 978-3-11-052929-6
e-ISBN (PDF): 978-3-11-053143-5
e-ISBN (EPUB): 978-3-11-052939-5
ISSN 1861-4078

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2018 Walter de Gruyter, Inc., Berlin/Boston
Typesetting: Compuscript Ltd., Shannon, Ireland
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

Contents

Jasmina Grković-Major, Björn Hansen and Barbara Sonnenhauser

Introduction — 1

Part I: The noun phrase

Jürgen Fuchsbauer

**Some observations on the usage of adnominal genitives and datives
in Middle Bulgarian Church Slavonic — 13**

Hanne Martine Eckhoff

**Quantifying syntactic influence: Word order, possession and definiteness
in Old Church Slavonic and Greek — 29**

Silvia Luraghi and Milena Krstić

The decay of cases in *Molise Slavonic* — 63

Part II: The verbal phrase and related topics

Hakyung Jung

Null subjects and person in Old North Russian — 95

Björn Hansen

**On the permeability of grammars: Syntactic pattern replications in heritage
Croatian and heritage Serbian spoken in Germany — 125**

Imke Mendoza

Possessive resultative constructions in Old and Middle Polish — 161

Slobodan Pavlović

Mechanisms of word order change in 12th and 13th century Serbian — 187

Sandra Birzer

**Historical development and contemporary usage of discourse structuring
elements based on *verba dicendi* in Croatian — 209**

Part III: The complex sentence

Marina Kurešević

The status and origin of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction in Old Church Slavonic — 261

Björn Wiemer

On triangulation in the domain of clause linkage and propositional marking — 285

Jasmina Grković-Major

The development of perception verb complements in the Serbian language — 339

Andrii Danylenko

A tale of two pathways: On the development of relative clause chaining in East Slavonic — 361

Barbara Sonnenhauser

Relativisation strategies in Slovene: Diachrony between language use and language description — 387

Index — 407

Barbara Sonnenhauser

Relativisation strategies in Slovene: Diachrony between language use and language description

Abstract: The Slovene relativisation markers *ki* and *kateri*, which contribute to the very individual nature of Contemporary Standard Slovene among the Slavonic languages, constitute a prime example for the complex processes underlying diachronic syntactic change. Their formal and functional development as evinced in historical data and analysed in linguistic descriptions shows a multitude of factors that interact not only on the linguistic, but also on the descriptive level. The specific situation in contemporary Slovene thus results from a development that has taken place at the interface of language and linguistics, being affected by both language use and language description.

1 The ‘oziralna dvoica’ *ki* and *kateri*

Brozović (1988: 187) emphasizes that the “complex and extraordinarily interesting nature of Contemporary Standard Slovene” can only be understood against the background of “its material base, the way it evolved, its special paths of development and [...] the specific circumstances in which it was elaborated” (1988: 185). Among the examples illustrating the specific nature of Slovene and the concomitant need for a multifactorial analysis are its relativisation strategies. This pertains in particular to indeclinable *ki* and adjectival *kateri*, which are both used for restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.¹ This *oziralna dvojica* ‘relativisation pair’ – as Toporišič (2000: 341) calls it – is puzzling in terms of synchronic usage patterns and diachronic development.

The contemporary usage patterns are briefly illustrated in (1) and (2). Both may be used for the relativisation of subjects, cf. (1a) and (1b):

¹ In free and correlative relative clauses, *wh*-pronouns + *r* (*kdor*, *kakor*, etc.) are used; see Chidambaram (2007) for a short overview.

- (1) a. *Zid, ki je delil svetove*
 wall which aux.3SG divide.PST.3SG worlds
 ‘The wall, which divided the worlds’
 (FidaPLUS)²
- b. *Ne bomo žalovali kakordrugi,*
 NEG will.1PL mourn.PST.PTCP like others,
kateri nimajo upanja.
 which not.have.3PL hope.GEN.SG
 ‘We will not mourn like the others that do not have any hope.’
 (FidaPLUS)

As regards the relativisation of non-subjects, *ki* requires a resumptive pronoun, as *jih* ‘them’ in (2a). For prepositional cases, only *kateri* is possible (see Topolińska 2003 for exceptions), cf. (2b):

- (2) a. *Podatki, ki jih je sporočil*
 information which them AUX.3SG tell.PST.3SG
 ‘The information_i, which [them_i] he told’
 (FidaPLUS)
- b. *Zagledal je hišo, v katero*
 notice.PST.M.SG AUX.3SG house.ACC into which
so vstopali ljudje
 AUX.3PL enter.PST.PL people
 ‘He noticed the house, **which** people stepped **into**.’
 (FidaPLUS)

For the relativization of direct and indirect objects both can be used. Elaborating the parameters underlying the choice between *ki* and *kateri* in these contexts is beyond the scope of the present paper (see, e.g., Topolińska 2003; Sonnenhauser 2013 for suggestions). The focus here will be on the diachronic development underlying the current state of affairs. As will be shown, different factors – usage based and description based – have to be taken into account: (i) language internal development, i.e. paths of development that can be motivated by general Slavonic processes, (ii) external, i.e. contact-related influences,

² The FidaPLUS corpus is a morphosyntactically tagged reference corpus for Slovene covering literary and non-literary written texts from 1979 to 2006. A detailed description of the corpus can be found in Krek & Kilgarriff (2006); see also http://www.fidaplus.net/Info/Info_index_eng.html (last accessed February 4, 2016). The FidaPLUS corpus has been included in the Gigafida corpus, which also includes texts from 2006 onwards (see <http://www.gigafida.net/> for access to the corpus and information concerning its makeup).

and (iii) metalinguistic factors influencing language description and grammar writing.

2 Diachrony I: Usage

To begin with, an overview of the usage of *ki* and *kateri* in older stages of Slovene will be given. Needless to say, ‘usage’ refers to the occurrence of both relativisation markers in written documents, which does not necessarily reflect oral language usage. However, since the usage in these documents is not yet subject to prescriptive norms, it can be taken as a good starting point for reasonable assumptions – at least concerning the scribe of the respective document. Differences encountered may thus be taken as evidence of regional variance and of potential contact influence.

One of the problems in dealing with the usage patterns of *ki* and *kateri* in older stages of Slovene is the poor data basis. There are only a few sources for the 10th to 16th century. During the reformation in the 16th century the number increases, but again decreases for the 17th to 18th century. The situation again changes with the beginning of the 19th century, when efforts to standardize Slovene set in.

2.1 The Freising manuscripts (10th/11th century)

The first written documents including what might – with all due caution – be called Slovene vernacular elements, are the Freising manuscripts (FM), dating to the late 10th/early 11th century. Here, forms of *iže* can be found, cf. *ife* in (3a), which can also be inflected and be used for non-subject (or rather non-nominative) relativisation, as indicated by *emuſe* in (3b):

- (3) a. *Naf gozbod zueticruz ifegeft bali teleznaffih [...]*
 our lord holy.Christ who.is physician bodies.ours
 ‘Our Lord, the holy Christ, *who* is the physician of our bodies’
 (Manuscript II.89–90; Toporišič 1981: 399)
- b. *ili efe mizetomu chotelo emuſe mibi*
 or because me.that wanted.N.SG which me.would
 ne doztalo choteti [...]
 NEG suited.N.SG want.INF
 ‘or because I wanted something [*which*] I ought not to have wanted’
 (Manuscript I.16–17; Toporišič 1981: 396)

Another relativising element encountered in the FM is *choi*, cf. (4) where it is accompanied by the resumptive pronoun *ih* ‘them.ACC.PL’:

- (4) *Eferoti Choi fe Ih nepazem [...]*
 or.oaths which PRT them NEG.we.keep
 ‘or oaths *which* we do not keep [*them*]’
 (Manuscript II.23–24, Toporišič 1981: 398)

As an interrogative-based relativising element, *choi* is to be distinguished from anaphora-based *iže* (Dogramadžieva 1989: 65, 66; see also Sections 3.1, 4), which Dogramadžieva (1989: 67) counts among those elements that have been kept from Proto-Slavonic without major changes. While both *iže* and *choi* are accompanied by the particle *fe* (*že* in contemporary orthography³), they differ in agreement marking, which is morphologically expressed for *iže*, cf. (3b), and with a resumptive pronoun for *choi*, see (4).

2.2 Early Slovene manuscripts (14th–16th century)

The few manuscripts dating to the 14th–16th century exhibit different instances of what look like variants of later *ki*, such as *kyr*, *kher* or *kir*:⁴

- (5) a. *Yaft veruyo wu boga othfcho [...]* *yno wu ihefuffa criftuffa [...]*
 I I.believe in god father and in Jesus Christ
kyr ye poczett od fwetiga ducha [...]
 who⁵ is conceived from Holy Ghost
 ‘I believe in God the Father and in Jesus Christ, *who* is conceived of the Holy Ghost’
 (*Rateški rokopis*, 1362–1390;⁶ Mikhailov 1998: 99, 3.I–IV)

³ The FM were written in Latin alphabet, which had not yet been adapted to the needs of Slovene at that time (the elaboration of the Slovene alphabet towards its contemporary form took until the mid-19th century).

⁴ In his edition and linguistic analysis of these manuscripts, Mikhailov (1998: 386) lists the emergence of the relativising element *ki* among those questions which come to mind when analysing these documents.

⁵ Mikhailov (1998: 101) analyses *kyr* as *ker* ‘because’: “*kyr* müsste die Kausalkonjunktion mod. slow. *ker* ‘weil’ und nicht irgendwelches Relativpronomen (vgl. *ki*) sein” [*kyr* must be the causal conjunction mod. Slov. *ker* ‘because’ and not some relative pronoun (cf. *ki*)]. The same holds for *kher* in (5b), cf. Mikhailov (1998: 207). The Slovene edition of these prayers has *ki* in both cases (Mikhailov 1998: 100, 206).

⁶ For the dating of the manuscripts see Mikhailov (1998: 16–18).

- b. *Otzha nafch kher fy vnebeffich*
 father our who you.are in.heaven
 ‘Our Father *who* (you) are in heaven’
 (Starogorski rokopis, 1492–1498; Mikhailov 1998: 206, 1.I)
- c. *ja odpušo vsejm tejm kir [...]*
 I I.forgive all those who
 ‘I forgive all those *who* [...]
- (Stiški rokopis, 1428–1440; Mikhailov 1998: 145, 5.LVII–LVIII)

The *Černejski rokopis* has *chi*,⁷ cf. (6a), which may also be inflected, as in (6b). Mikhailov (1998: 244) analyses *fchich* as genitive plural to *ki*:

- (6) a. *treti del jednoga mafa vmefti chife clize vpechol*
 third part of.one estate at.place which.REFL calls ‘vpekhol’
 ‘the third part of an estate at a place *which* is called ‘v Pekol’
 (Černejski rokopis, 1497–; Mikhailov 1998: 250–251, 9(50))
- b. *jeft oftavil [...] marach zeternaift fchich*
 AUX.3SG bequeathed.M.SG Marks fourteen with.which
marach jeft cuplegno dua ftara pfefnize [...]
 Marks AUX.3SG bought.N.SG two measures of.grain
 ‘He has bequeathed fourteen Marks, *with which* Marks two heaped
 measures of grain have been bought.’
 (Černejski rokopis, 1497–; Mikhailov 1998: 243, 4(45))

Only a few forms can be found in the Early Slovene manuscripts that seem related to *kateri*: the Starogorski rokopis has *kheter*, (7a) (vs. the Rateški rokopis, cf. (5a)) the Kranjski rokopos has *khatero*, (7b), and *sa khatere*, (7c):⁸

⁷ Possibly, this spelling is to be attributed to the influence of Italian orthography, if not to Italian itself, which has *chi* as relative pronoun. Given that the manuscript originates from Friaul (Mikhailov 1998: 79), this assumption seems not unwarranted.

⁸ Further relativisation markers, besides those related to *ki* and *kateri*, found in the documents dating to this period are *kemer* and *kigar*, see (i) and (ii).

(i) *Ya fe dalfan dam vffeymi greychy zkemer ta czlovik more greyffity [...]* (*Stiški rokopis*, 1428–1440; Mikhailov 1998: 129, 4.XII–XIII)

‘I admit being guilty through all the sins *with which* man can transgress’

(ii) *fam ze volnw wdall ty ablafti tyga /chudic zakygar [...]* *fam fe odpoueydall [...]* (*Stiški rokopis*, 1428–1440; Mikhailov 1998: 139, 5.VIII–IX)

‘I rendered myself voluntarily to the realm of the Evil *which* I have abjured’

Miklosich (1876: 149) derives *kemer* from *kyimiže*, i.e. *kyj*, which he assumes to underlie also the ‘Croat Slovene’ *ki*, *ka*, *ko* (ibid.).

- (7) a. *Yest veryo na boga [...] ynuy na Jhefuffa chriſtuffa*
 I I.believe in god and in Jesus Christ
 [...], **kheter** *ye podtzhett od fwetiga ducha [...]*
 who is conceived from Holy Ghost
 ‘I believe in God and in Jesus Christ, who is conceived by the Holy Ghost’
 (Starogorski rukopis, 1492–1498; Mikhailov 1998: 211, 3.I–V)
- b. *Jest Vafz opomenim, da Vy wote pouedalli. per thi*
 I you I.admonish that you will report with this
telefzni Rotwi khatero Ste Vy [...] perſeglj.
 bodily oath which aux.3PL you.PL took.PST.PL
 ‘I admonish you to report with this bodily oath *which* you took.’
 (Kranjski rukopis, 1140–; 1998: 185, V)
- c. *vtih rečeh. sa khatere Vy wodete Vpraſchanj*
 in.these things about which you.PL will.2PL asked
 ‘concerning these things *about which* you will be asked’
 (Kranjski rukopis, 1140–; 1998: 185, V)

Since the Kranjski rukopis is available only as transcript from 1871 (Mikhailov 1998: 181), these data have to be treated with caution, albeit it seems unlikely that the editor of the transcript would have interfered with syntax that essentially.

2.3 Protestant texts (16th century)

With the onset of the Reformation and its aim to propagate Protestantism among as many people as possible, the amount of texts increases from the mid-16th century onwards. In these texts, *kateri* is well attested in a relativising function and appears regularly, alongside *ki(r)*.

In (8a), *kateri* may be interpreted both as a free-choice pronoun (which indicates its interrogative origin) and a relative pronoun, while in (8b) it unambiguously functions as a relative pronoun.

- (8) a. *Vsaketeri, kir mene spozna pred tejmiludmi, tiga*
 everyone who me recognizes in.front.of these people, that.one
istiga jest hočo tudi spoznati [...]; kateri pak mene
 the.same I I.want also to.recognize who but me
pred ludmi zataji [...], tiga istiga jest hočo zatajiti [...]
 in.front.of people disowns that.one the.same I I.want to.disown
 ‘Everyone *who* recognizes me in front of those people, I also want to recognize; but *he who* disowns me, that one I will also disown.’
 (Primož Trubar, *Ena regiſter ... ena kratka poſtila*, 1558; Freidhof 1981: 19f)

- b. *ta ortografija* *drži,* *katero*
 that orthography keep.IMP which
našiga jezika idioma *inu natura* *potrebuje* [...]]
 of.our language idiom and nature requires
 ‘keep that orthography *which* the characteristics and nature of our
 language require’
 (Sebastian Krelj, *Postila slovenska*, 1567; Freidhof 1981: 63f)

In the course of the Counter Reformation, letter print came to a halt in central Slovenia. However, reformist books kept being printed in the periphery, notably in the Slovene-speaking regions under Hungarian Rule such as Prekmurje (see Jesenšek 2008 for a comparison of Trubar’s and Küzmič’s language in their catechisms). In these texts, *ki* and *kateri* appear, with *šteri* as an alternative form to *kateri*, cf. (9):

- (9) *Jožef pa* *i Maria* *Mati Jezušova*
 Jožef PRT and Maria mother of.Jesus
sta se čudivala *nad onim,* *štera*
 AUX.2DU REFL wonder.PST.2DU about these.things, which
so povedana *od njega.*
 are told from him
 ‘But Joseph and Maria, the mother of Jesus, wondered about that *which* was
 told by him.’
 (Mikoš Küzmič, *Sveti Evangeliomi*; Novak 1936, 39)

Since the present paper is concerned with the development towards the contemporary standard language, which is based on central Slovene dialects, the Prekmurian data (and other data from peripheral dialects of Slovene) will not be focused upon in more detail.

2.4 Contemporary Slovene

From the late 19th century onwards both *ki* and *kateri* have been in general use in written sources, with *ki* dominating in mere numbers⁹ (see the texts on <http://www.intratext.com/8/slv/>). It remains to be investigated as to whether there is a functional difference associated with the choice of form in contexts, where – from a syntactic point of view – both are equally possible (see Section 1). Several

⁹ This is based on evidence by inspection not on a thorough counting of tokens. As clear as this surface impression is, it cannot – of course – claim to be based on a representative sample.

factors have been suggested to play a role in this respect, such as register or type of relative clause (e.g. Gołąb & Friedman 1972). However, none of them seems to exhibit a statistically significant correlation with the choice of *ki* or *kateri*. A slight tendency can be observed for complex head NPs and relative clause attachment, in that *kateri* is preferred for NP₂-attachment, *ki* for NP₁-attachment (see Sonnenhauser 2013). Complex head NPs being rarer in the spoken than in the written mode, the preference for *ki* in oral communication may possibly emerge as a side effect of this syntax-based distribution.

2.5 Summing up

While various forms of putative predecessors of *ki* can be found already in the earliest documents, *kateri* appears in regular usage as a relativisation marker only from the 16th century onwards. The data prior to the 16th century being so rare and being restricted in terms of lexicon and topics (as pointed out also by Mikhailov 1998: 13f), this evidence has to be interpreted very carefully. These restrictions notwithstanding, the early Slovene manuscripts are of great value in that they indicate the complexity of the data and the multitude of analyses that might be applicable. This latter type of variety will be shown in the following section.

3 Diachrony II: Descriptions

The poor data basis is not only problematic for the identification of possible usage patterns, it also impedes the investigation of the formal and functional development of *ki* and *kateri*. This has brought forth various different analyses.

3.1 *Ki*

The origin and development of *ki* are fairly opaque and, as a consequence, explained in manifold ways (see also Sonnenhauser 2013: 156–159 for an overview). This pertains to two main questions: 1) whether *kir*, which is found until the 19th century, and contemporary *ki* are identical or derive from different sources, and 2) in which way *ki* and/or *kir* relate to *kateri*.

One line of analysis regards the emergence of *ki* as an instance of the general Indo-European replacement of **iō*-based pronouns by **kwo*-based ones (e.g. Kurzová 1981: 44). This fits the observation that OCS and the Freising manuscripts still have *īže*, while in later manuscripts only *ki(r)* is found. According to

another kind of analysis (see Cazinkić 2001: 56 and Snoj 1997: 228 for an overview of proposals), *ki* emerges from **yo* via *kir* < *ki-že* < *iže*. While final *r* can be accounted for in terms of rhotacism, i.e. the development of *ž* into *r* (a common development in Slovene), this proposal faces difficulties in accounting for the initial *k*-. This is then motivated in terms of analogy to other interrogative and relative pronouns.

Another assumption derives *ki* from **kъjъ* ‘who, which’, via *kyjъ*, *kaja*, *koje* (e.g. Topolińska 2003; Gołąb & Friedman 1972; Křížková 1970). One early attestation that could support this assumption is *choi* in the Freising documents (II, 23–24, cf. (4) above), which Dogramadžieva (1989: 65, 66) analyses as relativizing adverb with an interrogative root. Gallis (1956) draws a parallel to Kajkavian *ki*, *ka*, *ko* which he analyses as ‘contracted forms’ of *koji*, *koja*, *koje*, etc. While this could be supported by *ſchich* in the FM (see (6b) above), the development of *ki* into an indeclinable element remains to be accounted for.

Miklosich (1876) assumes *ki* and *kir* to be of different origins. He relates *kir* to **kъde-že* ‘where’ (via *kir* < *kjer* < *kder* < *kъde že*), and inflected forms of *ki* to ‘Croat Slovene’ (i.e. Kajkavian) *ki*, *ka*, *ko*. For the latter he cites one example from Krelj’s *Postila Slovenska* (1567): *v kim mestu* ‘at which place’ (1876: 149). This is interesting insofar as Krelj, unlike Trubar, aimed at a literary language that was closer to Croatian (see Kopitar 1808: 28; Seitz 1997: 98–101). Miklosich (1876: 149) further differentiates inflected and uninflected *ki*, arguing that the latter is a ‘recent’ (relative to his time) development and not found in older documents:

Das heutzutage gebräuchliche ki, das mit dem demonstrativen i verbunden und als relativum gebraucht wird [...] findet sich in den älteren denkmälern nicht: statt dessen gebrauchten trub. [Trubar, BS] und seine zeitgenossen das mit kъde že zusammenzustellende kir aus kjer, kder (1876: 149; italics in the original, BS)

[Contemporary *ki*, which is combined with demonstrative *i* and used as a relativising element is not found in the older documents: instead, Trubar and his contemporaries used *kir* which is to be grouped together with *kъde že*, deriving from *kjer*, *kder*]

In addition, Miklosich (1876) proposes a separate approach for ‘contemporary’ (i.e. 19th century) *kir*, which he distinguishes from *ki*. This is suggested by his analysis of *choi* in example (4) as deriving from *kyže*, which corresponds to „*heutzutage kir*“ ‘nowadays *kir*’ (1876: 149; italics in the original, BS). This obviously amounts to assuming two different kinds of *ki* and two different kinds of *kir* – a highly complex situation. However, given the variety of the data (cf. Section 2), this seems not categorically unlikely.

A relation between *ki* and ‘where’ is proposed also by Nuorluoto (2010), albeit a more indirect one than assumed by Miklosich. Nuorluoto does not regard

ki as an immediate successor of *kъdeže*, but assumes *ki* to have lost its inflection – which is still present in some Čakavian dialects – due to German influence: German *wo* ‘where’, which also functions as a relativisor (see also Danylenko this volume), has triggered the reanalysis of *ki(r)* as *kje* ‘where’ (Nuorluoto 2010: 42; see also Kopitar 1808).¹⁰

The complex situation concerning *ki* is also reflected in dictionaries. The *Dictionarium Latino-Carniolicum* (1608–1710; cf. Latinski) lists three entries for *kir*: one as a pronoun, one as locative adverb and one as conjunction (the latter giving Latin *ubi* as translation). Pleteršnik (2010 [1894]) has three entries that seem related to contemporary *ki*, cf. (10): one relating *ki* as a relative pronoun to *ker* and *kir*, one regarding it as part of a paradigm *ki*, *ka*, *ko* deriving from *kyj*, and a third one relating *ki* to *ker*, which in turn is assumed to relate to *kъdeže*, cf. (10):

- (10) a. *kî*, pron. rel. indecl. [...] – prim. [‘cf.’] *ker*, *kir*.
 b. *kí*, *ka*, *ko*, pron. = *kateri* [...] – prim. stsl. [‘cf. old Slavonic’] *kyj*.
 c. *kêr*, I. conj. [...] *zato*, *ker* [...] II. pron. rel. = *kir*, *ki*, Krelj; –
 „ker entspricht wohl einem altslov. kъdeže“ [‘ker corresponds to Old Slavonic kъdeže’], Mik[losich]. [...]

The entries in Pleteršnik suggest that three different lexemes might have been conflated in contemporary *ki*: *ki*₁ and *ki*₂ differ in tone, with *ki*₁ having a short falling (*kî*), *ki*₂ a long raising (*kí*) accent. Since tone is not equally prominent in all Slovene dialects, it may very well be the case that for some speakers, a difference between *ki*₁ and *ki*₂ was not noticeable, which in turn provided the basis for reanalysing them as identical – the more so, as their function is virtually identical. Reanalysis might also have been involved in the development of *ker* from *kъdeže*, accompanied by phonetic erosion (*ki* < *kir* < *ker*) and rhotacism (*r* < *že*).

The assumption of different origins for *ki* and *kir* and the distinction between contemporary uninflected *ki* and inflected *ki* is also reflected in the entry for *ki* in Snoj’s (1997) etymological dictionary, which proposes (1997: 228) that “[v] današnje *ki* sta verjetno sovpadli dve prvotno različni besedi” ‘in contemporary *ki*, most likely, two originally different words have coincided’, namely *kir* < **jb že* and **kъjb* (*že*).

¹⁰ The fact that many influential Slovene writers grew up in a German speaking environment may also have played a role.

3.2 *Kateri*

While the etymology of *ki* is fairly obscure, the origins of *kateri* are more obvious. It derives from a **kwo*-based pronominal element amended with **(t)ero-*, an Indo-European comparative suffix expressing relative contrasts such as the choice between a pair of entities (Meier-Brügger 2002: 225). This is also pointed out by Kopitar (1808: 297–298):

Kateri selbst ist, mittels der auch bey den Zahlwörtern und sonst z.B. *mnogiteri* (mancherley), vorkommenden Ableitungssilbe *eri* (*teri*) von *kdo* (oder der Wurzel *ki* (*k'*)?) abgeleitet. [spacing in the original, BS]
 [*Kateri* is derived from *kdo* (or the root *ki* (*k'*)?) by means of the derivation syllable *eri* (*teri*), which appears also with numerals and also, for instance, *mnogoteri* (*some*).]

It remains to be investigated in more detail whether the semantics ‘which of two’ (see also Gołąb & Friedman 1972) may account for the subtle functional differences between contemporary *ki* and *kateri* (as suggested in Sonnenhauser 2013).

One of the puzzles concerning *kateri* is the fact that on the one hand it “continues Common Slavonic *kъterъ-jъ*, with a secondary *a* inserted by analogy with pronouns such as *kako* and *kakšen*” (Topolińska 2003: 310), while on the other, it is rarely attested in a relativising function until the mid-16th century, i.e. until the Protestant texts (the situation is similar for West Slavonic). In its relativising function it has cognates in other present day Slavonic standard languages – except for South Slavonic. Kajkavian, however, seems to be closer to Slovene: Gallis (1956: 115) notes the appearance of “a new pronoun, namely *koteri* (*kteri*)” in the Kajkavian literature of 1500–1800, whereby ‘new’ obviously refers to its function only. Miklosich (1876: 150), too, points out that Croatian (i.e. Kajkavian) has *kteri* and *koteri*, besides *ki*, *ka*, *ko* (see also Vasilev 1973: 534 on this Slovene-Kajkavian parallel).

Moreover, forms of *kateri* can be found in the peripheral Slovene dialects, such as Prekmurian. The Prekmurian dictionary (cf. Prekmursko) mentions *šteri* as relative pronoun, equivalent to *ki* and *kateri*, and as an indefinite, free choice pronoun. Pleteršnik lists *šteri* (cf. Section 2.3) as well and annotates it as being attested at the river Ščavnica in lower Styria.

Obviously, thus, forms of *kateri* were extant in older stages of South Slavonic, at least in interrogative and indefinite function, but seem to have become out of use in the course of time. In Slovene, however, judging from the written documents available for that time, they have (re-)appeared in the 16th century, exhibiting now (also) a relativising function.

3.3 Summing up

As concerns the diachronic development of *ki* and *kateri*, we are faced not only with a diversity of forms, but also a diversity of descriptions. This leads to a rather complex picture. As regards *ki*, it remains unclear whether the forms discussed are indeed ‘different’, in the sense of having followed different diachronic paths, or whether they are ‘made different’ by the way they are described. For *kateri*, the question remains as to why it cannot be found in older documents and why/how it (re-)appeared in a relativising function in the 16th century.

4 Interplay of factors

The different analyses presented in Section 3 do not yield a clear picture concerning the origin and diachronic development of *ki* and the (re-)appearance of *kateri*. This fits the very essence of language, as Joseph (2013: 687–688) emphasizes:

Given the inherent complexity of language, of the creatures who use language, and of the social networks in which that use takes place, it should come as no surprise that it is rare to find single-factor answers to why aspects of language are as they are or to find single sources for synchronic phenomena in a language.

For the development towards the contemporary system of relativisation in Slovene, several factors must have been at work: (i) language internal development (derivation of *ki* from **kyj*, **iže* or *kъde že*; emergence of relativizing function for interrogative-based *kateri*), (ii) language contact by language users (reanalysis of *ki* as ‘where’) and grammarians ((re-)introduction and propagation of *kateri*), and (iii) factors influencing language description.

4.1 Internal development: Language change

The different explanations for the emergence of *ki* depicted in Section 3 can all be given inner Slavonic support, if older stages of closely related languages, mainly West Slavonic, are considered as well. Changes concerning **io*-based pronouns – be it replacement or formal development – can be observed in Sorbian (which has *kiž* and *kenž*, as pointed out already by Škrabec 1994 [1886]) and Czech (which has *jenž*, e.g. Kurzová 1981). Whether this supports the assumption of fronting *k-* to *iže* or the assumption of *ki* deriving from **kyj* remains an open question. In any case, a parallel development in Slovene and West Slavonic can be observed,

with the exact stages being subject to language specific processes (such as rhotacism, which is not found in Sorbian and Czech but is typical of Slovene).

The assumption that *ki* has resulted from a contraction of *koj* can draw on a parallel in terms of Kajkavian *ki*, *ka*, *ko*. Supportive evidence might be provided by *choi* found in the FM as well as *chi* and inflected forms thereof in the Early Slovene documents. Finally, the relation between *kȃde že* / *wo* ‘where’ and *ki(r)* too can be justified on language-internal grounds, see, for instance, Bulgarian *deto* < *kȃde-to* (already found in the early damaskini).

In order to judge the respective plausibility of these different analyses, more data would be needed. But even then it might well be the case that no clear-cut answer can be found. Conceivably, there is not one single source for *ki* and the (re-)introduction of *kateri*. Instead, different sources and different interacting developments are plausible which may, in addition, have been subject to processes of reanalysis.

4.2 External stimuli: Language contact

Given the pronounced multilingualism in the Slovene territories (see Ahačič 2014 for a description of the situation in the 16th century), contact influences are highly probable to have played a role in the development of the relativisation system.

Most of the Early Slovene and Protestant texts are composed by non-native speakers of Slovene or by bilingual individuals. The Early Slovene manuscripts are not only characterized by a mixture of dialects (Mikhailov 1998: 76), they are in part also composed by clergymen of Czech origin (e.g. the Stiški rokopis, Mikhailov 1998: 68–70) or written in a bilingual environment (e.g. the Starogorski rokopos, which has been written in the Slovene-Italian regions at the river Natisone, Mikhailov 1998: 76). Mikhailov (1998: 14) regards these circumstances as a crucial obstacle for obtaining a comprehensive picture of the situation and the development of the Slovene language at that time. From a different point of view, however, these data allow insights into language contact. Not yet striving for an over-individual, dialect-levelling norm, the Early Slovene manuscripts provide evidence for possible contact influences. The reanalysis of *ki* as ‘where’ may very well have been due to contact with German (which has *wo* ‘where’ as relativisation marker) – both as regards the language users and those describing the language. Also, Italian *chi* might have played a role in the formation of *ki*.

The 16th century marks a turning point in the history of Slovene, since first attempts of forming a literary language and establishing a norm date to this

period. Ahačič (2014: 33) speaks of a “watershed in the sociolinguistic development” of Slovene. The first books were printed in Slovene in order to propagate Protestantism to as many recipients as possible. To fit the new needs, the language had to be adapted. This adaption was driven by the need to convey high contents in a language as close to the spoken varieties as possible. Since no cross-dialectally valid norms had been developed for Slovene, and since it had not yet been elaborated to fit the needs for such abstract contents, the language in these documents may display dialectal features that are not present in all Slovene dialects, and exhibit features that are taken from or influenced by patterns available in other languages. The latter might be an explanation for the increasing usage of *kateri* as a relativisation marker. Possibly, *kateri* was (re-)introduced or calqued as a ‘high-level’ relativisation marker, by analogy with German *welcher*.¹¹ If so, this influence has to be one concerning the usage and distribution (interrogative as relative) of a native element. Matras & Sakel (2007: 829–830) describe this mechanism as pattern replication:

[T]he formal substance or matter is not imported but is taken from the inherited stock of forms of the recipient or replica language [...] it is the patterns of distribution, of grammatical and semantic meaning, and of formal-syntactic arrangement at various levels (discourse, clause, phrase, or word) that are modelled on an external source.

The fact that in addition to internal development, language contact on different levels seems to have contributed the (re-)analysis of *ki* and the (re-)introduction of *kateri* fits Joseph’s (2013: 682) assumption that “[i]n some instances [...] contact with speakers of other languages can be one of the multiplicity of sources”. He goes on to point out that words may enter from outside even if there is a native word, which then yields a synchronic situation in which “there are multiple forms with a single – or at least related – meaning” (ibid.); again this situation can also be observed for Slovene.

Language contact is possible not only on the level of the languages themselves. It may as well be effective on the descriptive level, in terms of influences on the descriptors and their analyses. Contact-induced reanalysis is thus plausible both with speakers when using the language, and with speakers describing the language and propagating prescriptive rules.

¹¹ For Polish *który*, Gallis (1956: 11) assumes Latin influence. In a more general perspective, this type of relativization marker deserves closer diachronic and comparative analysis among the Slavonic languages, in terms of functional (interrogative, relative), syntactic (introducing relative clauses preceding or following the matrix clause, relative clauses with ‘internal nuclei’; e.g. Mendoza 2010; Mendoza & Sonnenhauser 2015) and formal, i.e. morphological (see Majer 2015) respects.